

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Lopez-Torres et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,647) (hereinafter, *Lopez-Torres*.)

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Examiner states that *Lopez-Torres* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that *Lopez-Torres*, in FIGs. 1 and 2 thereof, shows a packet data service network (PSDN) connected to a base station, as recited by Claim 1 of the present application. However, after reviewing FIGs. 1 and 2 of *Lopez-Torres*, as well as the corresponding text therein, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusions.

First, *Lopez-Torres* in essence discloses a communication system, a mobile services switching center for allowing a multi-dialogue communication to take place between a first subscriber station (MS1, MS2,...MSn) and a second subscriber station (ISDN, ST1) through a mobile services switching center (MSC/VLR) of a public land mobile network (PLMN).

With reference to Figure 1 of *Lopez-Torres*, a mobile switching center (MSC) having a mapping device portion (MP) coupled between a first subscriber (MS1) and second subscriber (ST1, ISDN) via a first and second communication channel, respectively, is distinctly shown. In other words, the mapping portion (MP), as described in *Lopez-Torres*, facilitates multi-dialogue calling for both speech and video transmission between a first MS and a second MS or an ISDN terminal. Likewise, in Figure 2, a similar block diagram is shown illustrating the channel connections established between both the ISDN and the MSC, and the MSC and the first MS. Hence, no packet data service network (PDSN) is shown or even fairly suggested in either FIG. 1 or 2.

In contrast to that which is taught in *Lopez-Torres*, Claim 1 of the present invention includes the recitation of a method for concurrently providing a first service between a mobile station (MS) and a mobile switching center (MSC) and, more importantly, a second service between the “mobile station” (MS) and “a packet data service network” (PDSN), which is neither taught nor suggested by *Lopez-Torres*.

Here, the Examiner first incorrectly equates the “ISDN network,” as taught in *Lopez-Torres*, with the “PDSN network,” as recited by Claim 1 of the Application. As such, it remains that *Lopez-Torres* does not teach the recitation of providing a second service between the mobile station (MS) and a packet data service network (PDSN), as recited by Claim 1. Secondly, no reference is made in *Lopez-Torres* to a “single” MS receiving, concurrently, two separate and distinct mobile services (i.e., a voice or a packet service), as recited in Claim 1. In other words, unlike the present invention, *Lopez-Torres* merely teaches a method of facilitating multi-dialogue calling between two (2) mobile stations.

Accordingly, as *Lopez-Torres* alone does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 3, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 5, and 7 included similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully believes that Claims 3, 5, and 7 are patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

As to Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges that these claims all depend from Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, respectively. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that if the above-mentioned argument places independent Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 into condition for allowance, then dependent Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 are likewise allowable.

Thus, in view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/CEA/fl